

Note on the Official Reckoning of the reigns of the later Moghul Emperors and on some of their Mint Towns.

By W. IRVINE, ESQ., I.C.S. (retired.)

In the Philological Secretary's Report on a recent find of coins (Proceedings for June 1893, p. 116), I see that he adopts 1069 H. (Sept. 1658—Sept. 1659), as the year from which Aurangzib 'Alamgír's reign is reckoned. On grounds which I think are overwhelmingly strong, I propose to substitute 1068 H. (Sept. 1657—Sept. 1658.)

Among European writers we find considerable difference of opinion as to the year in which 'Alamgír began his reign. To mention the latest writer first, Mr. S Lane Poole, in his "The Moghul Emperors of Hindustan" (1892), p. xxvi, says "in May 1659 (1069) he," *i.e.*, 'Alamgír, "was proclaimed Emperor." I see, however, that in his later work "Aurangzib" (1893) in the series "Rulers of India," Mr. Lane Poole dates the reign from July 1658 (see the Table on p. 21 of that work). Again, in the "Oriental Biographical Dictionary" of T. W. Beale, p. 33, we read "but ('Alamgír) was not crowned till the first "anniversary of his accession, a circumstance which has introduced "some confusion into the chronology of his reign." This statement, in identical words, is found in Elphinstone's "History of India" (4th ed. p. 525), and he relies on Kháfi Khán. Grant Duff ("History of the Mahrattas," Bombay reprint, note on p. 72), although he prefers 1658 (*i.e.*, 1068 H.) to 1659 as the correct year, seems to have suggested Elphinstone's remark. Grant Duff writes "Aurangzebe appears to "have begun by reckoning his reign from the date of his victory over "Dara, to have subsequently ascended the throne in the following year, "and then changed the date, which he again altered by reverting to "the former date (*i.e.*, 1068 H.) at some later and unknown period." Grant Duff, like Elphinstone, relies upon Kháfi Khán. Now, Kháfi Khán (in the printed text, at any rate) is not to be altogether trusted in the matter of chronology; but I think that in this instance Grant Duff's note misrepresents the facts, even as recorded by Kháfi Khán.

Kháfi Khán founded his statements, as is tolerably obvious, on the *Tárikh-i-dahsálah* or 'Alamgír-námah of Muḥammad Kázim, and on the *Ma,áṣṣir-i-'Alamgíri* of Muḥammad Sáki Musta'id Khán. The latter for the first ten years of the reign, is itself an abstract of Muḥammad Kázim's work (see p. 65 of the printed text of the *Ma,áṣṣir*). The facts, then as related in the 'Alamgír-námah, the source from which all others are drawn, are as follows:—

Muḥammad Kázim commences the second year (1069 H.) with a long excursus on the necessity for a system of chronology and the varying modes of reckoning time, with some remarks on Akbar's Divine Era and that followed by Jahángír. Those two sovereigns reckoned from the 1st Farwardín and used a solar year. He then informs us that Sháhjahán restored the use of the Muḥammadan era; and that 'Alam-gír followed his father's practice. "And although the first fortunate enthronement happened on the 1st Zú, l-ka'dh, 1068 H; yet, the effulgence of victory and success and the rising of the world-illuminating light of that founder of the horoscope of felicity and prosperity having thrown the ray of joy on the world in the month of Ramzán of their year (1068 H ?), and the appearing of the star of strength and perpetuity of that chosen one, full of splendour, having lighted up the face of Fortune and Good Luck in those days; the first day of that month of blessed omen, which was the new moon of limitless felicity and pregnant with both worldly and spiritual blessings, was chosen as the first day of the years of that reign, rich in mercies; and the exalted order obtained issue that in offices and calendars and patents and rescripts, they should make record after that manner, and reduce into writing after that fashion all occurrences and the reports of events. Accordingly, by the rule so fixed, I have to this point written with my descriptive pen the story of one year and twenty-four days belonging to the felicitous epoch of the sovereignty and empire of that One worthy of the faith-protecting throne. And previous thereto there are entered the events of four months belonging to the auspicious time of his being still only a Prince of the Blood, beginning from the day of the departure of the victorious army, intent on world-conquering and realm-seizing, from the province (*khítah*) of fortunate foundation, Aurangábád, which took place on the 1st Jumádí I, 1068 H. (*in words*), ending" [*i.e.*, the said four months, Jumádí I, Jumádí II, Rajab, and Sha'báu, 1068 H.] "with the 1st of Ramzán of that year, which is the first day of the years of that reign full of happiness. Altogether the period covered is 1 year, 4 months, and 24 days. Then will follow the second year." After this passage he goes on to the festivities held to celebrate the accession, the abolition of the *Nau-roz* festival, and the substitution of another to be amalgamated with that of the 'Yd-ul-fiṭr. Next, we have the appointment of a Muḥtasib, or Censor, as in Muḥammad Sáqí. (*'Alam-gír-námah*, B. M. Addl. MSS., Nos. 26, 229, foll. 102b. to 104a.) I have no copy of the printed text, and therefore cannot give references to it, but the passage can, I have no doubt, be very easily found.

Next in order of date comes Muḥammad Sáqí Musta'id *Khán* and

his *Ma,âşîr-i-Âlamgîrî*. The parallel passage to that quoted above from the *Âlamgîr-nâmah* will be found on pp. 22–25 of the printed text. But I will turn first to an earlier page as it explains the circumstances of the previous enthronement in 1068 H. 'Âlamgîr determined to proceed to the Panjâb in pursuit of his brother, Dârá Shukoh. He set out from Akbarâbâd on the 22nd Ramzân, 1068 H. (23rd June 1658.) The astrologers having selected the 1st Zûl-ka'dh, 1068 H. (31st July 1658), or 11th Amardâd of the Ilâhî year, as the auspicious moment for his enthronement, and there being no time to proceed to the palace at Dihlî and there prepare for this august act, 'Âlamgîr halted for several days at the garden of Agharâbâd [also called Shâlihmar, it was just north of Dihlî] to take advantage of the said propitious moment. There he seated himself on the throne of good fortune.....As the preparations for this ceremonial were on a limited scale, most of the observances of an enthronement were put off to the second anniversary (*jalâs*). On this occasion no *khuṭbah* was read, no coinage issued, and no imperial titles fixed upon. These matters were postponed. [*Ma,âşîr-i-Âlamgîrî*, p. 8].

[*Idem*, pp. 22–25.] Year 1069 H. This corresponds to the extract above given from Muḥammad Kâzîm. "Since the ceremonial of the first enthronement, by reason of the advance into the Panjâb and from want of time, was on a reduced scale, while the reading of the *khuṭbah*, the issue of coin, and the fixing of the imperial titles were postponed; now that more important affairs had been arranged, orders were issued to prepare for the festival" "And on the fortunate day, Sunday, the 24th of the blessed month Ramzân, in the year 1069 H. (15 June 1659), or the 25th Khurdâd of the Ilâhî year, when his age was 40 solar years, 6 months, and 17 days, or 41 lunar years, 10 months and 2 days, 'Âlamgîr seated himself on the throne." The *khuṭbah* was read, coin issued, offerings presented, and gifts bestowed.

The Muhammadan creed was no longer to be impressed on the coin, but, instead, a distich, composed by Mîr 'Abd-ul-Bâkî, was approved. The new emperor's titles were settled; and *farmâns* issued to all provincial governors, announcing the new reign. Several chronograms for the occasion are given; these yield 1069 H. Then follow these words: "As the shining of the light of the victory diffused its felicitous rays on the world in the month of Ramzân, the exalted order was issued that they should record in offices and calendars the 1st of that month as the commencement of the years of this reign." After this comes a passage about the abolition of the *Nau-roz* festival, and the institution instead of it of a festival to be called *Nishât-afroz*. It will be noticed that Muḥammad Sâkî does not expressly state the year, from the 1st

Ramzán of which the reign was dated. But neither he nor Muḥammad Kázim, from whom he copies, give any countenance to a reckoning commencing with 1069 H. On p. 30 and p. 34 we find that according to Muḥammad Sáqí, the third year (not the second) began in Ramzán 1070 H., the fourth year (not the third) in Ramzán 1071 H., and so on, throughout the book, to the end of the reign. For his period, the first ten years, Muḥammad Kázim follows exactly the same rule. Finally, Muḥammad Sáqí [*Ma,áṣir-i-'Alamgírí*, pp. 520 and 523] records that 'Alamgír died early on Friday, the 28th Zú,1-ka'dh 1118 H. (2nd March 1707), in the 51st year of his reign, having reigned 50 lunar years, 2 months, and 27 days. This accords exactly with the mode of reckoning laid down by Muḥammad Kázim. For, if we calculate from the 1st Ramzán 1068 H. to the 28th Zú,1-ka'dh 1118 H.), we get as result (1118y. 10m. 28d.)—(1068y. 8m. 1d.)=(50y. 2m. 27d.). Kámwar Khán, in his *Tárikh-i-Saláṭín-i-Chaghṭaiyah*, gives the same number of years, months, and days; but I attribute to him no independent authority for this reign, having found wherever I have compared the two authors, that Kámwar Khán gives Muḥammad Sáqí's facts, in identical order, but in different words.

I add two more extracts from Muḥammad Sáqí, as the second of them records a slight change in the observance of the anniversary, and this may have been the reason that Grant Duff thought the date of accession had been twice altered—[*Ma,áṣir 'Alamgírí*, p. 30]. Year 1070 H. The third year of the reign commences. The anniversary ceremonies begin on the 24th Ramzán (4th June 1660). [*Idem*, p. 34]. Year 1071 H. The fourth year commences. "Although the date of enthronement (*sarír-áráí*) was the 24th Ramzán, and in the previous year "the festival began on that day, yet owing to its falling in the time of "the Fast, when there is no inclination to enter into rejoicings, the beginning of this year's festival was fixed for the day of the 'Yd" (*i. e.*, 1st Shawwál). It lasted ten days.

Kháfí Khán's passage, parallel to those in Muḥammad Kázim's *'Alamgír-námah*, and Muḥammad Sáqí's *Ma,áṣir i 'Alamgírí*, will be found in the Bibliotheca Indica Text, Vol. II pp. 76-79. As it is translated, nearly in full, by Dowson in Elliot's *History of India*, VII, 241, I need not reproduce it here. I only note that Dowson's "4th Ramzán" is the 24th Ramzán in the printed text. Although Kháfí Khán here expands rather than contracts what Muḥammad Kázim wrote, it is strange that he omits the all-important statement that the reign was made to begin on the 1st Ramzán. I have looked through the text on pp. 76-80, and I cannot find any mention of this fact. Kháfí Khán, II, 549, gives the length of the reign as 50 years, 2½ months; and even these figures, though not

strictly accurate, preclude any reckoning from 1069 H., but carry the first day into 1068 H.

Again, I find in a somewhat later writer, *Khushál Chand*, author of the *Nawádir-uz-Zamání*, the following statement. He wrote in the reign of *Muhammad Sháh* (1131-1161 H.) and was old enough to recollect the excitement caused in *Dilí* by the news of 'Alamgír's death. He himself, like his father before him, was a clerk in the Central Revenue Office, and a man likely to have, if any one had, exact knowledge on the point under discussion. His words are: "Although the first auspicious enthronement took place on the 1st of the month *Zú, l-ka'dh*, 1068 H. (30th July 1658), yet as the blessed rays of the brilliant light of victory and success were displayed to the world in the month of *Ram-zán*, the first day of that blessed month was assumed as the commencement of these years full of miracles, and the exalted order issued that in all offices, and calendars, and patents of appointment, and royal rescripts, this rule should be adopted, in opposition to that of previous sovereigns, rulers in *Islám* who, following the practice of *Jamshíd*, *Kakhir* (*Kasrú*?) and others, held *Farwardín* to be the most excellent month, and appointed it for the commencement of their reigns. This rule was now abrogated, and the years of the fortunate reign were appointed to be reckoned by lunar months from the month of *Ramzán*" [B.M. Addl. MSS. No. 24027, fol. 490b.] For this work and its author, see *Elliot*, VIII. 70, 71. Here he is evidently writing with *Muhammad Kázim's* or *Muhammad Sáqí's* work before him. The 1st *Ramzán*, 1068 H., is equivalent to the 2nd June 1658.

We can now account for *Muhammad Sáqí's* statement (*Ma,áqir-i-'Alamgírí*, 523), that 'Alamgír reigned 50 years, 2 months, 27 days.

I think that these authorities prove, without any room for doubt, that 'Alamgír counted his reign from the 1st *Ramzán*, 1068 H., and after that date had been once fixed upon, no alteration was ever made. This is the result arrived at by considering the historical evidence alone. Do the extant coins of the reign conflict in any way with its historians? Now, there may be some reason for thinking that occasionally some numismatists (in this branch of their subject, at any rate), concentrate their attention too much on the coins themselves, to the neglect of contemporary historians from whom they might derive much assistance. For we are dealing here with a modern period, on the history of which there is an abundance of material available. Be that as it may, let us, too, confine our attention for the moment to the coins themselves. The coins of 'Alamgír, which are already to be found in the British Museum collection, constrain us, unless some of those coins are a posthumous issue, to throw back the initial year of the reign from 1069 H. to 1068 H.

Dated coins for the 51st year of a reign necessarily imply fifty completed years of that reign. Now, the silver coins Nos. 843–846 in the British Museum, are dated in 'Alamgír's 51st year. On the other hand, there is no dispute about the date of his death; it took place in 1118 H. Even if we allow up to the last day of that year, where can you find room, within that limit, for fifty completed years, unless you throw back the first day of the reign into some part of the year 1068 H. ?

As I am led to believe, the argument for 1069 H. is founded on the rule that the enthronement, the reading of the *Khuṭbah*, and the issue of coin, taken together, form of themselves the official act of accession. In cases where there is no proof to the contrary, I see no reason to quarrel with this assumption. Indeed, for some purposes, it might even be the only right date to consider. For instance, if I wished to fix the date from which 'Alamgír became undisputed sovereign, I should, with Mr. S. Lane Poole, elect for the year 1069 H. On the other hand, if a sovereign, in defiance of facts, chooses to fix an assumed or fictitious date for his accession, it is useless for us to say that he had no just right to do so. The all-important things for us are: 1st, to know that he ordered the adoption of such official date; and 2ndly, to ascertain, on the best evidence, what that date was. Of all the acts of sovereignty hardly one can be held more formal and official than the issue of coinage: and can we suppose that on the face of that coinage any date would appear, other than one fixed according to official reckoning? Over and over again, we find that the official reckoning and the date of accession, according to actual facts, are altogether discrepant. It is so in the case of 'Alamgír.

BAHÁDUR SHÁH. His father died at Aḥmadnagar, in the Dakhin, on the 28th Zú'l-Ka'dh, 1118 H. (2nd March, 1707). He heard of the event at Jamrúd, west of Pesháwar, on the 18th Zú'l-Ḥajj, [Kámwar Khán, *Tárikh-i-Saláṭín-i-Chaghtaiyah*, my copy, and Jag Jívan Dás, Gujaráti *Muntakhab-ut-Tawárikh*, written in 1120 H., [B.M. Addl. MSS. No. 26,253]. He was enthroned at Pul-i-Sháh Daulah Darvesh, about 15 miles west of Láhor, in Muḥarram 1119 H. Muḥammad Kásim, Láhorí, *'Ibratnámah*, India Office Library, No. 252, and Jag Jívan Dás, already cited). Muḥammad 'Alí's *Burhán-ul-Fatúḥ* (B.M. Oriental MSS. No. 1884, fol. 162b.), fixes this enthronement on the 24th Muḥarram (26th April 707). He gained a complete victory over his brother 'Azam Sháh at Jájau, near Aḡrah, on the 18th Rabi' I. 1119 H. (18th June 707)—(Dáuishmand Khán, 'Alí *takhallus* "*Jangnámah*," and Kháfí Khán, 11, 590). But on the 1st Shawwál 1119 H. (25th Dec. 1707), he issued an order that his reign should commence from the 18th Zú'l-Ḥajj, 1118 H. (22nd March 1707), the day that he heard of his father's death

[Dánishmand *Khán*, 'Alí, in his *Bahádur Sháh-námah*, entry of the said date and *Kháfí Khán*, Text II, 607]. The passage in Dánishmand *Khán* reads as follows: "The 1st Shawwál, 1st year, Ghásí Rám, principal clerk to the Chief Intelligencer, or *Wákhiahnigár-i-kul*, made a report asking for orders fixing the date from which the reign was to be reckoned, that the same might be entered in the official proceedings. "Orders issued to take the 18th Zú'l-Hajj, and a report was called for as to the New Year's day by the solar year. In reply this was stated to be the 1st Farwardín and a Sunday. That day was accordingly fixed and ordered to be recorded." [B.M. Oriental MSS. No. 24, fol. 95a.]. This may mean that the 1st Farwardín or the 18th Zú'l-Hajj was adopted. If the former, that would be the 10th or 11th Mareh, equal to the 5th or 6th Zú'l-Hajj, 1118 H.

JAHÁNDÁR SHÁH. As he did not survive to begin a second year's reign, there does not appear to have been any order passed fixing an official date for his accession. He was enthroned in the plain east of Láhor on the 21st Şafar, 1124 H. (29th Mareh 1712) [Núr-ud-dín, Multání, *Jahándár-námah* and Kámwar *Khán*, *Tárikh-i-S.-i-Ch.*], his father, Bahádur Sháh, having died on the 20th Muḥarram, 1124 H. (27th February 1712) [Kámwar *Khán*].

FARRUKHŞIYAR. He heard of his father 'Azím-ush-shán's death near Láhor, when he was himself at Paṭuah-'Azímábád. He was enthroned there, in the *bágh* known as Afzal *Khán*'s, on the 29th Şafar, 1124 H. (6th April 1712) [Muḥammad Aḥsan, Ijád, *Farrukh-shiyar-námah*, B.M. Oriental, No. 25, fol. 40a.]. On the 9th Jumádi II, 1125 H. (2nd July 1713), he ordered that Jahándár Sháh's reign should be struck out of the records and treated as non-existent. He directed at the same time that his own reign should be dated from his enthronement at Patna, namely the 29th Şafar, 1124 H. [Kámwar *Khán*, *Tárikh-i-S.-i-Ch.*: entry of 9th Jumádi II, 1125, and *Khushál Chand*, B.M. Or. 3288, fol. 397a.] *Kháfí Khán*, II, 737, has the wrong year, 1123 instead of 1124. He and *Khushál Chand* have the 1st Rabí' I, which is, of course, the next day to the 29th Şafar, so that there is no practical difference, on this point, between them and Kámwar *Khán*.

RAFÍ-UD DARJÁT. As he reigned for a few months only, no order was passed fixing officially the first day of his reign. He was enthroned in the palace at Dihlí on the 9th Rabí' II, 1131 H. (28th February 1719) [Kámwar *Khán*, *Tárikh-i-S.-i-Ch.*: and *Kháfí Khán*, II, 816]; he was deposed and sent back into the palace on the 17th Rajab, 1131 H. (4th June 1719), and he died there on the 24th of the same month (11th June 1719) [Kámwar *Khán*, and *Kháfí Khán* II, 830].

RAFÍ-UD DAULAH. This prince was the next elder brother of the

preceding. At his brother Rafi'-ud-darjât's earnest request he was selected as successor, and raised to the throne some days before his predecessor's death. The enthronement took place in the palace at Dihlí, on the 19th Rajab, 1131 H. (6th June 1719) [Kámwar Khán, bnt Kháfi Khán, II, 831, has tho 20th]. The prince died in camp near Agra, on the 4th or 5th Zú,1-Ka'dh, 1131 H. (17th or 18th Sept. 1719) [Kámwar Khán]. In his case also no question can arise, as he did not survive to enter a second year.

NEKÚSIYAR. This pretender, son of Prince Muḥammad Akbar, the fourth son of 'Alamgír, was proclaimed by the mutinous garrison from the battlements of Agra Fort, on the 29th Jumádí II, 1131 H. (18th May 1719) [see Kháfi Khán, II, 825, Kámwar Khán's *Tárikh-i-S.-i-Ch.*, and Muḥammad Kásim's *Ibratnámah*]. Nekúsiyar surrendered to Sayyad Ḥusain 'Alí Khán between the 22nd and the 27th Ramzán, 1131, H. (July 7-12, 1719) [Kámwar Khán].

MUḤAMMAD SHÁH. This prince was brought from Dihlí and reached the imperial camp on the 11th Zú,1-Ka'dh, 1131 H. (24th Sept. 1719) [Kámwar Khán and Kháfi Khán, II, 840]. He was enthroned on the 15th Zú,1-Ka'dh, 1131 H. (25th Sept. 1719), at a village called Bidyápur, between Agra and Fatḥpur Sikri, three *kos* and a fraction from the latter place [Kámwar Khán and Kháfi Khán, II, 840]. It was directed that his reign should be reckoned from the deposition of Farrukhsiyar [Muḥammad 'Alí Khán, *Tárikh-i-Muzaffarí* and Kháfi Khán II, 841]. Accordingly it is counted usually from the 9th Rabí' II, 1131 H. (28th Feb. 1719). But the contemporary authority, Kámwar Khán, gives the first of that month, namely the 1st Rabí' II, 1131 H. (20th Feb. 1719), as the exact reckoning.

I may note that the dates of the Christian era, given in this paper, are all calculated according to the Gregorian or New Style. I have used the "Practical Tables...." of Johannes von Gumpach, London, James Madden, 1856.

Although not strictly within the scope of this paper, I append some remarks on Moghul mint-towns, as likely to be of use to any one interested in my more immediate subject, and I am not likely to find any other early opportunity of placing the results on record. These notes are in continuation of those printed in the Society's *Proceedings* for January 1893.

'ALAMGÍRPUR. Places with this name seem very hard to find; I therefore note those I know of. But in the absence of special reasons for doing so, it would be hazardous to suggest that either is the mint-town for coin No. 772 of the British Museum Catalogue. I find by an

entry in Kánwar Khán's *Tárikh-i-Saláṭín-i-Chaghṭaiyah*, that on the 22nd Ramzán, 1122 H. (13th Nov. 1710), Bahádúr Sháh was encamped at Azímábád Taláorí, "alias 'Alamgírpur," being the halting place between Karnál and Thánesar. Also, if I recollect rightly, there is a village 'Alamgírpur elose to the east or left bank of the Jamuná, in the Saháranpur district. 'Alamgír was in that part of the country, on at least one occasion, on a hunting expedition to Bádsháhi Mahal and parganah Faizábád (Saháranpur District).

MU'AZZAMÁBÁD. I have little or no doubt that this mint town should be identified with Gorakhpur, Şúbah Audh. When I was serving in that district I recollect seeing the name Mu'azzamábád, Gorakhpur, used in the *Mawázinah* and *Kanúngoí* papers of the end of the last century, which twenty years ago were still in existenece. Only a few days ago, I was reading the autobiography of some un-named dependant on Fazl 'Alí Khán, once 'Amil of Gházípur. For a few years Fazl 'Alí Khán, was *Faujdar* of Gorakhpur (F. Curwen's translation of Khair-ud-din Muḥammad, Allahábádí's, *Tuḥfah-i-Tázah*, p. 19). When speaking of this appointment, this anonymous writer calls the place "the *Sirkár* of Sarwár, otherwise Mu'azzamábád-Gorakhpur."

NAŞRATÁBÁD. In the *Ma'áşir-i 'Alamgírí* (p. 304, year 1098 H.) 'Alamgír, after taking Haidarábád, advanced against Sakkhar, a place between Bájápur and Haidarábád. It was then ruled by Nand (or Parya, or Paid) Náik, a man of the low Dheḥh caste. After it had been taken, the country (*úlkah*) of Sakkhar was by the Emperor's orders re-named Naşratábád [*ibidem*, p. 307]. For other notices of it, under its new name, see pp. 344, 345, 360, 364, 384, 410, 416, and 513 of the same volume. It is also mentioned as Naşratábád-Sagar in the *Ma'áşir-ul-Umrá*, II, 291. Thornton, *Gazetteer*, 936, states that "Suggur" is a town in the Nizam's territory, Lat. 16° 36', Long. 76° 51', 124 miles S.-W. by W. from Haidarábád. On the map of India in Johnston's Royal Atlas it appears as Sagar.

SHÁHÁBÁD KANAUJ. In the British Museum Catalogue, p. 212, there is a coin No. 1019, which the author assigns (p. lviii) to Sháhábád in Audh, disregarding the second word, which he reads *Fatúh*. I think there can be little doubt that this word should be read *Kanauj*, قنوج. The name is usually spelt by Muhammadans with ق, see, for instance, Kháfi Khán, Text I, pp. 63, 73, 109; also throughout the *Ain i Akbarí*, Blochmann's translation, I, 32, etc. (entered in his Index under Q). I was four years in the Farrukhábád district (in which Kanauj is included), and my recollection is that the old official name of the place was Shahábád Kanauj. It is so styled in Dowson's Elliot, VIII. 46. I thus propose Kanauj, Şúbah Akbarábád, instead of Sháhábád, Sirkár Khairábád, Şúbah Audh.

ZAFARÁBAD. Since I wrote my former remarks I have found a direct mention of the occasion when B́idar was re-named Zafarábád. It is also frequently called Muḥammábád B́idar. The passage I refer to is in *Kháfi Khán*, II. p. 3. He tells us that in 1066 H., the thirtieth year of Sháhjahán, Prince Aurangzib was appointed to make a campaign against Bijápur, just after he had "by notable exertions, acquired the fort of B́idar and the Ś́ubah of Aḥmadábád, and the fort of Kaliyáuí, and "had re-named them the Ś́ubah of Zafarábád."

~~~~~

*Note on the preceding Paper.*—BY DR. A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

I fully agree with Mr. Irvine that Aurangzib's reign should be dated from 1068–1118 A. H. or 1658–1707 A. D. I had never made any special enquiries on the exact official date of his accession, and the initial date 1869, given in my coin-reports in the *Proceedings* was simply quoted as that usually assigned. That it is wrong,—if the reign is to be counted from the *officially* fixed date, and not from the date of the *actual* accession,—Mr. Irvine has amply established; and I agree with him, that it is more reasonable to accept the official date as fixed by an emperor himself.

I should, however, put "the two all-important things for us" rather in this form:—1. To know what date was officially fixed by an emperor; 2, to ascertain whether the date, officially fixed, was actually adhered to in dating coins and documents of his reign.

Now with regard to Aurangzib, nearly all his coins do adhere to the officially fixed date. There are, however, a few exceptions:—

1. There is the coin, No. 845 of the British Museum, dated in 1119 H́ijrah, and 51 regnal. It is the only one with this peculiar date that I remember to have come across. As Aurangzib died on the 2nd March 1707, and the H́ijrah year 1119 only commenced on the 3rd or 4th April 1707 (or the 1st Muḥarram 1119), it is clear that either the date 1119 is wrong, or that the coin is posthumous. That the latter may be the true explanation, appears from the following facts:—Aurangzib's successor was Bahádur Sháh. He heard of his father's death only three weeks afterwards, on the 22nd March 1707, and his *actual* enthronement took place only on the 26th April 1707, that is, on the 24th Muḥarram 1119. It was not till the 25th December 1707, that the official date of his accession was fixed to be the 22nd March 1707. It is, therefore, quite possible that coins struck in the time intermediate between the 2nd March 1707, the date of Aurangzib's death, and the 26th April 1707, the date of Bahádur Sháh's *actual* accession, were still issued in Aurangzib's name. It would thus occur that a coin,